



**A. H. @a\_h\_reaume** Tue Dec 13 04:04:22 +0000 2022

People want to pretend social media moderating misinformation or incitement is an unprecedented infringement on 'free speech.' What social media is instead is an unprecedented amplification of misinformation and speech. Moderation only mimics guardrails that have always existed.

Prior to social media, mass media platforms always had publishers. Entire systems of effective (and sometimes ineffective) checks and balances. Editors. Fact checkers. Civil liability. Government regulation.

The right is pretending that something was taken from them -- but there is no pre-lapsarian platform or amplification device that allowed people to directly spread any kind of misinformation and incitement to thousands or millions of people without getting fact checked.

Even political speech was always mediated by someone(s) who was ostensibly trained in journalistic standards -- and would potentially have to answer for spreading misinformation or incitement -- internally, in the media, professionally, or from federal regulators.

No politicians have EVER had the type of unmediated direct access to millions of voters or readers previously. Why? Lots of reasons. The technology wasn't there. There was a belief that truth mattered. There was also a recognition that it was dangerous.

Misinformation is important to combat because people deserve a right to make choices based on the truth -- especially voters. Misinformation can also be a tactic of incitement or of politicizing things that do harm to the people reading them but benefit the writer politically.

For example, people have died because they refused blood transfusions that might have vaccinated blood in them. The wild conspiracy stories that get passed around on social media -- sometimes from politicians -- reach many more people than the conspiracy theories of the past.

Incitement is also an issue. That includes the use of platforms to call for violence against a group -- or to dog whistle about stolen election to the point that a group of 'patriots' storm the capital calling for the execution of the vice-president.

Blood-thirsty mobs is ACTUALLY a bad thing. Especially blood-thirsty mobs meant to disrupt vote certifications so that an alternate slate of electors can be installed to actually steal an election.

I know that memories are short... but that seems like something we should be spending more time trying to figure out how to STOP on social media. Not saying they went too far to punish the guy who literally created a conspiracy to steal an election with a fake slate of electors.

Here's the thing. Anyone who is saying that moderating speech that creates harm to that level on social media is something that should STOP is someone saying that its okay to have a second insurrection. Perhaps one organized by MTJ with guns like she said on the weekend.

Moderation protects democracy. It does not undermine it. There has never been mass unmoderated speech. Anyone calling for that is calling for a new paradigm -- not a return to any old one. And given the situation they're calling for it around -- how it will be used is terrifying.

This is a process of manufacturing consent or justification for allowing the amplification of incitement or misinformation in the future. It's focused not on evening out the balance between political sides but on allowing one side to deepen its misinformation campaign.

Did you notice how the Tw\*tter files don't include examples of when left leaning politicians spread misinformation and weren't banned? Or incited violence and had no consequences. It's not about political equality -- its about establishing the right to mass incite and misinform.

But there has NEVER been a right to mass incite and misinform. And extending one now will have disastrous consequences. It will be used. And people will die.